REMARKS

Introduction

No claims have been amended. The application continues to include claims 1-31. Reconsideration of the rejection of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The Claims Are Allowable Over the Prior Art

Claims 1, 12, 23 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oberlander et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,825,865 ("Oberlander") in view of Gordon, U.S. Pat. No. 5,608,786. Claims 2-11, 13-22 and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oberlander in view of Gordon and further in view of Blonder et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,708,422 ("Blonder"). Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested because Oberlander, Gordon, Blonder, and the other cited prior art fails to disclose packet-based telephony processes having dynamically assigned protocol addresses and in which a server stores the protocol addresses in order to establish an Internet telephony communication.

In making the above rejections, the Examiner has failed to point out where in the prior art various limitations of claim 1 are disclosed. For example, claim 1 recites "dynamically assigned protocol address that is dynamically assigned upon connecting to an Internet". In connection with this limitation, the Examiner states that "Oberlander et al. does disclose the call packets can be of the types of paging message, FAX message, ISDN message and/or E-Mail. It is well known in the art for routing these

2

messages via Internet, providing these messages to include IP addresses in the header." *See* Jan. 8, 2003 Office Action, page 3. Even if it is known in the art that these messages can be routed, the Examiner has provided no disclosure that call packets include an IP address that is **dynamically assigned upon connecting to the Internet**.

In addition, claim 1 recites "wherein a central server stores the dynamically assigned protocol addresses to establish an Internet telephony communication between the telephony processes". With regard to this limitation, the Examiner states that "It is also well known in the art to include a connection server for storing IP addresses for Internet telephony communication". *See* Jan. 8, 2003 Office Action, page 3. First, applicants disagree that this limitation is "well known in the art". The Examiner is required to point out the "relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate". *See* MPEP 706.02(J). Therefore, applicants request an identification of the specific prior art that discloses that limitation. Second, the limitation requires storing "**dynamically** assigned protocol addresses". The Examiner has failed to address this limitation entirely.

Based at least on the foregoing, claim 1 should now be allowable. Independent claims 12, 23 and 31 include similar limitations as claim 1. Based at least on the foregoing, these claims should also be allowable. The remaining claims each depend from one of the above independent claims, and therefore should also be allowable based at least on the foregoing reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and favorable action in connection with this application.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 or credit any overpayment to Kenyon and Kenyon Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Date: February 5, 2003

Barry S. Goldsmith
Registration No. 39,690

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Ph.: (202) 220-4368
Fax.: (202) 220-4201